
we should ^{acquiesce} ~~agree~~ and
concentrate our efforts on
contractors initially.
The DoD folks are right.
All we're saying is it's too
hard to do. They're saying the
same about document control.
It all depends on whose ox... etc.

NdA "RETRO-FIT" REQUIREMENT

1. Paragraph 5 of the draft DCID 1/19 requires that "all persons holding or being given SCI access shall sign an NdA."
2. The CIA member advised that his agency does not intend to require some persons (to include certain contractors and ranking Governmental officials) who are already SCI indoctrinated to sign an NdA. The CIA member noted that CIA rules on conditions of employment already have NdA-like restrictions.
3. The State and OSAF members observed that their activities were awaiting publication of DCID 1/19 to if, in fact, the language in paragraph 5 would make it mandatory for them to require all currently indoctrinated persons under their cognizance to sign an NdA.
4. Most other members objected to any language allowing a member agency to exclude certain types of persons from signing an NdA. The belief was that this would seriously undercut the NdA program and result in application of "double standards" for currently indoctrinated persons. Examples were cited wherein contractors working for the same company but on different agency billets would compare agency requirements on the NdA and have cause for objection. The Justice Department member advised that a lawyer acting on behalf of a person required to sign an NdA could cite the CIA policy with telling force.